

Engl. Hist. Top. Vol 7.

THE
REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE,
TO WHOM THE
PETITION
OF THE
PRINCIPAL INHABITANTS

OF THE
Several PARISHES of St. MARTIN IN
THE FIELDS, St. ANNE, St. JAMES, St. GEORGE
HANOVER-SQUARE, and St. MARGARET, within
the Liberty of *WESTMINSTER* (so far as it
relates to that of St. MARTIN IN THE FIELDS,
against their *Select Vestry*) in Behalf of themselves,
and the Rest of the Inhabitants of the said respective
Parishes was referred,

MADE TO
The Honourable the HOUSE of COMMONS,
by the Right Honourable JOHN Lord PERCIVAL, Chairman
of the said *Committee*, on *Tuesday* the 25th Day of *May*, 1742.

THE WHOLE
Shewing the NATURE and MANAGEMENT of the said *Select Vestry*,
for several Years past, with the COMMITTEE'S *Remarks* thereupon.

L O N D O N:
Printed in the YEAR M.DCC.XLII.

[Price One Shilling.]

THE
REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE
TO WHOM THE
PETITION
OF THE
PRINCIPAL INHABITANTS

OF THE
Several Parishes of St. Martin in
the Parishes of St. Anne, St. James, St. George
Hanover Square, and St. Margaret, within
the Liberty of WESTMINSTER, for as it
relates to that of St. Martin in the Fields,
against their ~~several~~ ^{several} ~~several~~ ^{several} in Behalf of themselves
and the Rest of the Inhabitants of the said several
Parishes was referred.

MADE TO
The Honourable the House of COMMONS
by the Right Honourable James Lord Percival, Chairman
of the said Committee, on 14th March 1745.
THE WHOLE
Shewing the Nature and Manner of the said Petition
for several Years past, with the Committee's Answer thereupon.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year 1745.
[Signature]

THE
REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE

TO WHOM

The PETITION of the Principal
INHABITANTS of the City and Liberty
of *Westminster* was referred.

THE Committee to whom the Petition of the Principal Inhabitants of the several Parishes of *St. Martin in the Fields*, *St. Anne*, *St. James*, *St. George Hanover-Square*, and *St. Margaret*, within the Liberty of *Westminster*, in Behalf of themselves, and the rest of the Inhabitants of the said respective Parishes, was referred, have, in Pursuance of your Order, proceeded to take the same into Consideration :

AND, to avoid that Confusion which must have arisen in a blended Enquiry, as well as to distinguish those Parishes, in which the greatest Errors might be found, from such as might deserve less Censure, determine to consider the Allegations of the Petitioners, with respect to each Parish distinctly, under which Determination of the Committee, the Agents for the Petitioners readily acquiesced, observing only, that as the several Parishes had united in one Complaint, they did not take upon them to prove the full Allegations of that Complaint seperately in each Parish, but in all the Parishes taken together, which were named in the Petition.

The Committee then proceeded upon the Parish of *St. Martin*.

Mr. *Skute* and Mr. *Adderley*, Agents for the Petitioners in that Parish, first undertook to prove, That the Vestry assessed and levied
B the

the Watch-Rate ; in Support of which Allegation, they produced the Watch-Rate of the Year 1740, signed by several Members of the Vestry, whose Hands were proved by Mr. *Middleton*, Collector, and Mr. *William Godfrey*, Vestry-Clerk of the said Parish.

The latter of whom being examined concerning the Method of making the Rates, said, That he usually made out the Rate from that of the former Year, leaving Blanks for the Sums to be charged upon the respective Inhabitants, which Blanks are afterwards filled up by the Vestry. That these Rates are always cast up before the Justices signed them, and that no Alterations are made in them after they are so signed, which was in about a Week after the Rate has been made up as aforesaid.

Whereupon the Agents for the Petitioners produced the Watch-Rate for *Drury-Lane* and *Long-Acre* Ward of 1741, in which Books not a single Page was added together ; from which the Managers presumed the Rates may have been left open in former Years till the Collection was ended.

To this the Petitioners likewise produced the Book of Vestry Orders for the said Parish, wherein it appeared, that a Committee of Vestry was appointed, *September 21, 1725*, (*Vide Appendix, Numb. I.*) to examine the Poor's-Rate, to make it more equitable, and to rectify it ; and that it was there resolved, That 1s. in the Pound must be raised for the Relief of the Poor in that Parish for the Year ensuing ; and your Committee desiring to be informed, whether the Practice had been the same in latter Times,

An Order of Vestry was produced from the same Book, dated *April 7, 1740*, (*Vide Appendix, Numb. II.*) resolving, That the Rate for the Poor should be at 8d. in the Pound ; and it appeared further, that, on the 24th of the same Month, (*Vide Appendix, Numb. III.*) the said Resolution was read, and, upon further Consideration, was repealed by the Vestry, and by them increased to 10d.

The Committee then calling for the Rates for the Poor, which were made in Consequence of these Orders of the Vestry, it appeared, that these Rates were entered, as if made in a legal Manner, being said to be assessed by the Rector, Churchwardens, some of the ancient Inhabitants, and signed by two Justices, according to the Form prescribed by the Act of 43 *Elizabeth*. And,

Mr. *William Godfrey*, the Vestry Clerk, being called in, was required to inform the Committee, whether a publick Notice was always given to the proper Officers and Inhabitants to meet for the making of the Poor's-Rate as the Law requires ? He said, That such Notice was constantly given. Being asked, Whether the Inhabitants did attend by Virtue of that Summons ? He said, They did : But being further questioned, Whether by Inhabitants he meant Inhabitants at large, or only such Inhabitants as were of the Select Vestry ? He acknowledged, they were only such as were Members of the Vestry ; and that no others attended, as he remembers, except in the Year 1740, when the Disputes at Law arose between the Parish and the Vestry. Being then asked, Why the other Inhabitants did not attend ? He answered, Because the Vestry, being a Select Vestry, thought they only were intended by the Word Inhabitants.

He confessed, The Vestry proposed and settled the Poor's-Rate before it was offered to the Justices to sign : And being then asked, If this Rate, when once settled by the Vestry, was ever, in any Instance, altered

altered afterwards by the Justices? He said, Never, except in one Instance, and that was in the Year 1740, after the Parish had contested their Rights at Law with the Vestry.

Mr. *Miller*, a Justice of the Peace, being examined, informed the Committee, That he had been frequently at the Vestry when they made the Poor's-Rate, and he was the only Justice of the Peace present.

Mr. *Fabrie* being examined as to the levying the said Rates, said, That he was distrained, by an Order of the Select Vestry, for Non-payment of the Watch-Rate that was about *September* or *October* 1740. Being summoned to attend the Vestry upon this Account, he demanded, Whether they sat there as a Vestry, or a Petty-sessions, they answered, As a Vestry: He then complained of the Rate, and they told him, They would distrain if he did not pay: He said, That it was an illegal Rate, because there were many Erasements in it; many were over-rated, many under-rated, and many not rated at all—The Vestry then told him, If he would swear that he had been over-rated, they (the Vestry) would reduce him; but he told them, They could not legally alter the Rate after it had been signed by the Justices.—He therefore refused to swear; but that, while he was with the Vestry, many other Persons offered their Complaints and were sworn in his Presence; and that, thereupon, the Vestry ordered they should be reduced, and that he saw the Vestry-Clerk, at that Time, alter the Rate in Pursuance of the said Orders of the Vestry.

Mr. *Philips*, a Grocer, being examined, said, That, upon looking into the Rates, he observed himself rated more than he ought to have been; he complained, and he was told, He should appeal to the Vestry; that he did, that Mr. *Turner*, a Laceman, and a Vestryman, treated him at first in an over-bearing Manner; but that, after some Discourse, he (the said *Turner*) ordered the Vestry-Clerk to alter the Rate in his Favour, which he did, and he was accordingly reduced from 40*l.* to 35*l.* and that only one Justice of the Peace (Mr. *Frazier*) was present at this Meeting of the Vestry.

Mr. *Thomas Middleton*, the Collector, being examined as to the Method of levying the Watch-Rates, acknowledged, That when Persons complained of being over-rated, the Vestry verbally gave him Leave (going with the Churchwarden, or Vestry-Clerk, the former of which he looks upon as the Umpire of the Vestry) to collect less than the Rate after it was signed by the Justices; but that he has no written Order for that Purpose; and being asked, What the Abatement might generally be, he said, That as to the Watch-Rate in particular it amounted to about 1400*l.* per Annum; but that he collected not above 1000*l.* Being then desired to acquaint the Committee, In what Manner he made those Abatements? he said, He did it by a Mark upon a blue Leaf which was kept in the Book for that Purpose: And being further questioned, To whom he gave in his Accounts, and from whom he received his Acquital? He said, He delivered them to the Vestry-Clerk, who cast them up for him, and that he looks upon the Vestry-Clerk's Approbation to be his Acquital; that he is never questioned further; that the Vestry knows he collects in this Manner, and that he takes less than the Rate; that they never found Fault with him for so doing, nor make any further Enquiry of him, and are satisfied with the Account in his own Hand-writing: That the Accounts, after

after they are cast up for him by the Vestry-Clerk, are laid before the Vestry, and he knows nothing of what passes afterwards.

Mr. *Godfrey* being again called, was examined as to the making and levying of Rates, and confessed, That the Vestry did reduce particular Persons in the Rate, upon the bare Memorandum of the Collector on the blue Leaf. He said first, The Justices make a Memorandum likewise, that the Persons so reduced were over-rated; but acknowledged afterwards, That tho' two or three Justices were sometimes present, yet this Business was sometimes transacted in the Presence of one Justice of the Peace: And at last confessed, That once, within these twelve Months, it had been done by the Vestry without any one Justice; but said, He could not recollect any other Instance.

Whereupon the Petitioners produced an Order of Vestry, which they called, *An Order of Petty-Sessions*, when only one Justice of the Peace was present.

Mr. *Miller* informed the Committee, as to the levying the Rates, That, in some Cases, the Justices have reduced the Rate upon the Oath of the Party, and in some upon the Credit of the Party without an Oath: That the Vestry give Notice to the Justices, and order them to attend when there is to be a Day of Appeal; but that the Vestry attend likewise, and the Business is done in a Vestry: That the Justices give a Sanction to it; but that they are meer Cyphers, and that the Vestry govern and manage all these Matters; that there are generally eight or ten Vestry-men present, and sometimes two Justices, sometimes one, and sometimes none at all; and that the Vestry do what they will in every Thing.

Being asked, Whether the Power of abating legally lay in the Justices or in the Vestry? He answered, That, if the Justices give their Opinion, it just signifies nothing; that if they attempt to comptrol the Vestry, they over-power and brow-beat them; and that in one, when he desired to look into their Management, Mr. *Turner*, the Laceman, then in the Chair of the Vestry, told him, That if he went on in that Manner, he would get him turned out of the Commission of the Peace. Being then questioned as to the Power of the Vestries, to relieve, upon Oath, after the Rate was legally signed, he said, It was the common Custom of a Select Vestry, and he did not care to contend with them in any Thing.

Your Committee observed many Erasurements in the Rates, both in the Sums and in the Names, frequently no less than three or four in a Page, particularly in the first Rate to the Watch for the Year 1736, *Folio 14*, where *William Meeks*, *George Errington*, a Coach-maker, and Vestryman, and *Mary Oliphant*, were entered upon an Erasurement. In the same Book, and in the same Rate, *Folio 2*, Entries of the Names of *James Gascoigne*, and *Joseph Creswell*, in like Manner. In the same Book, *Folio 4*, an Erasurement both in the Rate and Money-Column. In *Folio 11*, two Erasurements; and in *Folio 10* no less than five in the Money-Column only.

Mr. *Godfrey*, Vestry-Clerk, being examined in this Particular, and the Book of the Watch-Rate *Spur-Alley-Yard*, 1740, being produced, and an Instance shewn of a Name erased in *Folio 8*, he answered, That it was erased because it was reported by the Collector to be an empty House, and that there were sometimes three or four Tenants in it in one Year, which created Confusion. The second Rate of the Watch for the same Year being produced, and a Name appearing to be altered,

Folio

Folio 69, he said he could not tell by whom that Name was altered. Being asked, Whether he had any Authority to make any Alterations after the Rate was signed by the Vestry? He answered, Only to alter Blots; and endeavoured to convince the Committee, that these Erasurements were only on account of Blots, or on account of Mistakes in copying from the former Rates, which he corrected before the Rates were signed by the Vestry.

Mr. *Miller* informed the Committee, That the Rates ought to be fair, without Erasurement, when the Justices sign it; but that he has never taken much Notice of the Rates, or of Erasurements in the Books, before he signed them; for that seven or eight Vestrymen make the Rate, and then it is brought to the Justices, and he apprehends it a Matter of Course to sign it: But that, once, upon the Book being brought to him for Payment, he observed many Erasurements, which he believed to have been made after the Justices had confirmed the Rate. Upon which he complained, but was answered, That it was done by the Vestry, and was told by the Collector, That after the Justices had signed, the Vestry made the Erasurements.

Thomas Middleton, the Collector, being further examined as to an Erasurement in the first Watch-Rate, 1738, over-against the Name of Dr. *Pierce*, Rector, in which he was reduced, answered, That it was altered by Order of the Vestry after the Rate was signed; and that he was reduced again, in the next half Year, by an Erasurement likewise, because he claimed to be totally excused: But that, upon the late Uneasiness in the Parish, on account of the Conduct of the Vestries, he has, since that Time, been raised again.

Dr. *Pierce*, Vicar of *St. Martins*, being examined, said, That he had paid the Watch-Rate from the Time of the Commencement of the Act, which was in the Year 1736. That he was first rated at 40*l.* and that his House is worth as much; but that it was altered afterwards from 40 to 30*l.* He acknowledged, that this was done without a regular Complaint, the Collector only taking of him at the Rate of 30*l. per Annum*. That, the Gentlemen of the Vestry thought this reasonable, because it was a new Tax; and that his Predecessors had been usually excused all other Parish Taxes, because they never demanded the Burial Fees for the Poor; which Burials might amount to 700 in each Year. He cannot answer by whom his Rate was reduced; but since that Time he has consented to be rated at 40*l. per Annum*.

The Agents conceiving they had sufficiently proved that the Vestry assessed and levied the Watch-Rate, and that they assessed that of the Poor, desired that the Acts of Parliament might be read relating to both.

And, it appeared by the Watch-Act, 1736, That, the Vestry, and two Justices of the Peace of the City and Liberty of *Westminster*, are impowered to make and confirm the Rate.

Whereupon the Agents for the Petitioners observed, That the Justices could not comptrol the Vestry in this Matter.

And, that the Vestry taking upon them to make Erasurements, and to alter the Rate, after it was signed by the Justices, was, in Effect, the same Thing, and the same in its Consequences to the Parish, as if the Justices were not at all concerned in it; so that they humbly apprehended it to be a mere Evasion of the Law.

As to the Poor's-Rate, the Law requires by 43 *Eliz.* That this Rate shall be made and assessed by the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor, with the Consent of two Justices of the Peace; they therefore conceived, the Vestry, in making the said Rate, have acted contrary to Law; and they took Notice further, from the Evidence that had been given to this Head, that the Forms observed in the Words prefixed to the Rates, were an Imposition on the Publick; for, that the Vestry did, in fact, appear to make the Rates, tho' they were in some Cases signed by the Justices, in the Manner that the Law directs.

Lastly, That the Assumption of these Powers, contrary to Law, by the Vestries, was of fatal Consequence to the Parish; for that, they were thereby obliged to engage in expensive Suits at Law, to defend their Rights, in which they contended under the greatest Disadvantage, since the Vestry defended themselves with the Parish Money; and to defend this Allegation, they produced an Order of Vestry dated the 27th of *November 1740.* (*Vide Appendix Numb. IV.*) When the Inhabitants having appealed against the Rate for the Watch, 'That all Charges at Law, in Defence of the Vestry, should be paid out of the Watch-Rate, and that Mr. *Clarke*, Mr. *Lloyd*, and Mr. *Sollicitor Strange*, should be retained as Council in this Behalf.'

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to prove, that the Vestry audit the Accounts of the Parish.

And they produced several Books of Accounts audited by the Vestry, and, among others, the Poor's Account of 1734 and 1735; also of the Year 1738, audited in the Year 1740; also an Order in the Vestry Minutes the 29th of *March 1725,* (*Vide Appendix Numb. V.*) for a Committee to audit the Accounts; as likewise a Report made from the Committee to the Vestry, on *February* the 4th in the same Year (*Vide Appendix, Numb. VI.*) concerning the Application of the Poor's Money to the Church Account, which was then allowed.

William Godfrey, the Vestry-Clerk, being then called in, was directed to inform the Committee in what Manner the Watch Accounts are audited by the Vestry? He said, That the Vestry receive the Books of Account, which he, or his Clerk, casts up, and then lay them before the Vestry: And being asked, Whether he apprehends it his Duty to cast up every Page before he presents it to the Vestry? He said, He conceives it is: That the Vestry look upon the Account, cast up two or three Pages, and takes the rest for granted, that he reckons Abatements and Arrears in one Account of Arrears, and that the Vestry never examine whether he does or not. Being asked, Whether he compares the Account of the Collector with the general Account delivered to the Vestries? He said, He does. Being asked, Whether the Vestry ever reprimanded the Collector for taking less than the Sums assessed? He said, That they often had, Hundreds of Times; for he abates without Order of Sessions, and sometimes without Order of Vestry; but let him (the Vestry Clerk) complain ever so often of the Collectors Proceedings, it would not signify, for he was accustomed to account under the Burgeses Court, before the Watch Act passed, when it was a discretionary Rate, and he got into such a Way that he cannot get out of it. Being asked, If the Vestry had not Power to remove him? He said, They had, but they never offered

to remove him ; that the Collector excused himself always by saying, That the Inhabitants paid less Rents than they were rated at ; but that neither the Vestry-Clerk, nor the Vestry, inquired after it any further, and that he was never made to account by the Vestry. And being asked, Whether, if this be the Manner of accounting, the Collector might not receive the Whole, and account for less? He acknowledges, That he might.

The Agents for the Petitioners then produced the first
Rate to the Watch 1736, *Folio* 14. The Total of the
Collection, as cast up in the Book, was

l.	s.	d.
2	1	6

But upon casting up the Sums, Article by Article, the
Total appeared to the Committee to be

l.	s.	d.
2	11	6

So that the Totals, cast up by the Vestry Books, appeared to be deficient 10s in this Page. Upon which the Committee called for the Leidger Book of the Parish, in which the Total of each Page are entered, and the Sum there entered appeared to be 2l 1s 6d. whence it was apparent, that, in the Account of this one Page alone, there was a Sum of 10s received more than was accounted for to the Parish.

The Agents for the Petitioners then produced the second
Rate to the Watch for *Spur-Alley-Ward* for the Year 1740.
Folio 2. and in this Page the Total of the Arrears, cast up
in that Book, was

l.	s.	d.
1	3	4

But being cast up, Article by Article, the Money paid
short of the Assessment, was no more than

l.	s.	d.
0	19	0

Yet this Arrear was carried into the Leidger, according
to the false Total, as cast up in the Book, and allowed in
the Parish Account ; so that there was a Sum in this Page,
not brought to Account, of

l.	s.	d.
0	4	4

In the same Book, *Folio* 3. the Total of the Arrear in
the Rate Book for that Page, and thence carried into the
Leidger, was

l.	s.	d.
1	6	8

But upon casting up this Page, Article by Article, the
Money paid short of the Assessment appeared to be no
more than

l.	s.	d.
0	17	10

So that the Sum not brought to Account in this Page,
amounted to

l.	s.	d.
0	8	10

In the same Book, *Folio* 4. the Total of Arrears, as
cast up at the Bottom of the Page, and carried forward to
the general Account of the Parish, was but

l.	s.	d.
3	10	9

But the Page being cast up, Article by Article, the
Money paid short appeared to be no more than

l.	s.	d.
3	3	9

So that the Sum not brought to Account in this Page is

l.	s.	d.
0	7	0

In the same Book, *Folio* 6, the Total of the Arrear,
as cast up at the Bottom of the Page, and carried forward
to the general Account of the Parish, was

l.	s.	d.
1	3	4

But this Page being cast up, Article by Article, the
Money paid short appeared to be

l.	s.	d.
0	18	4

So that the Sum not brought to Account in this Page is

l.	s.	d.
0	5	0

In the same Book, *Folio* 7, the Total of the Arrear, as
cast up at the Bottom of the Page, and carried thence to
the general Account, was

l.	s.	d.
3	10	8

But

But this Page being cast up, Article by Article, the	l.	s.	d.
Money paid short appeared to be no more than	2	12	6
So that the Sum not brought to Account in this Page is	0	18	2
Tho' the whole Affessment in the Page amounted to no more than	5	13	0
And, in <i>Folio</i> 21, of the same Book, the Total of Arrear, as cast up at the Bottom of the Page, and carried to the general Account, was	2	13	8
But this Page being cast up, Article by Article, the			
Money paid short appeared to be no more than	1	8	8
So that the Sum not brought to Account in this Page, amounted to	1	5	0

In this Page it appeared to the Committee, That, out of the whole Sum assessed, which was but 3^l 0^s 4^d. the Sum paid to the Parish, was no more than 6^s 8^d. and that of the Remainder 1^l 8^s 8^d was abated after the Rate was signed, and without any legal Warrant ; and 1^l 5^s received, and never accounted for.

The Committee having observed Instances of the same Nature, almost in every Page which they examined in this Account, ordered *William Godfrey*, the Vestry-Clerk, to be called in.

And being asked, In what Manner the Accounts are audited by the Vestry? He said, That he and his Clerk, having cast up the Books, they are laid before the Vestry: That he apprehends it to be his Duty to cast up every Page before he lays the Account before them ; and that he compares the different Accounts with the grand Account, which he delivers to them ; but being shewn the Books of the Year 1740, he acknowledged, That he had not compared that Book.

Being asked, Whether he reckons the Abatements and Arrear in one Article of the Arrears? He answered, That he always does. Being asked further, If the Vestry examine him, whether he accounts in that Manner? He said, That they do.

Being questioned, Whether the Vestry take it as a sufficient Answer, that he, or his Clerk, having compared the Books? He said, They do, and that the Vestry take two or three Hours in casting up two or three Pages, and take the rest for granted, leaving him to examine the Remainder. The Watch-Book being then produced, and an Instance being shewn where the Arrears were returned greater than in Fact they appeared to be, he said, That he believed the Collector received the Money after the Account for the Year was closed.

And being asked, Whether the Monies so received, after the Account was closed, were accounted for to the Parish? He said, That they never were.

Being further asked, Whether the Collector's Accounts were made up according to the Leidger? He said, They were: Whereupon the Leidger was produced, and it appeared to the Committee, that the Collector had accounted short to the Parish 18^s 2^d in that Instance: To which he said, That the Fact was evident, but that it probably would never have been discovered if this Inquiry had not been made.

Your Committee not having met the Day following, upon their next Meeting, the said *William Godfrey* desired to be examined again to this Particular, and endeavoured to account for these Deficiencies before-mentioned, by an Article in the Watch-Leidger, ending *May* 1741. of 14^l 13^s 11^d. which he said was Money collected upon the old Rate, between

tween the 26th of *July* and the 20th of *August*, 1741. and, being asked for the Particulars, he said, The Collector had them.

Whereupon the Agents for the Petitioners observed, That, in the last Day's Examination, he (*William Godfrey*) had declared the after Collections were never accounted for.

The said *William Godfrey* being further questioned, Why the Arrears were carried into the *Leidger* different from the Arrears in the Books from which they are taken? He gave no Answer but, That his Clerk was to blame.—And being then asked, Whether he was not paid for making up these Accounts? Whether it was not his Duty to do it? And, Whether he was not accountable for the Errors of his Clerk? He answered, That he was paid; and that it was his Duty to do it; but that he cannot attend to every Thing. Being further asked, Whether it was not his Duty to cast up the Sums? He acknowledged that it was. Being then questioned, Whether he had done it five Times, four Times, thrice, twice or once since he had been Vestry-Clerk? He confessed, That he could not take upon him to say, that he had done it once.

Being then desired to inform the Committee, Whether any of the Particulars of the gross Accounts are laid before the Vestry? He said, That he could not tell, but, he believes, they may be laid before them by the Collector. Being then required to acquaint the Committee, How this Matter passed in the Vestry? He said, That he laid before them the Totals of the Account, and all the Vouchers; that two Vestry-men usually examine the Receipts, and cast up here and there a Page; that he is present with his Vouchers in a Bundle ready to produce as they are called for. But being particularly asked, Whether the Vouchers, for the Receipts, were produced in the Year 1741. the Year in which the Committee then enquired? He acknowledged, That nothing was then produced but the gross Account.

And being then required to say strictly, Whether the Vestries do not take his Account without examining into it all? He at last owned, He could not say but that they might have taken it without Examination; except in one Instance.

The Agents for the Petitioners produced an Order of Vestry of the 27th of *July*, 1741 (*Vide Appendix, Numb. VII.*) wherein it appeared, That the Vestry audited the Account of *Thomas Middleton*, Collector for the Watch-Rate, ending *May* 1741, and audited the 27th of *July* following; and that they ordered the said Collector to pay the Ballance to *Mr. Thomas Siddall*.

The Committee then observed, That the Sum of 4*l* 15*s* 11*d.* which was an Article in this Account, and which *Mr. William Godfrey*, the Vestry-Clerk, had produced to obviate the Objection made, as before-mentioned, to the Collector's Account, and which he endeavoured to persuade the Committee to take as Money in Arrear, collected after the Account had been made up, between the 27th of *July* and the 20th of *August* following, was either a Misrepresentation of the said *William Godfrey*, or an Article inserted after the Books had been audited, since the Books were audited and confirmed upon the same 27th Day of *July*, 1741; so that no Sum received after that Day, or between that Day and the said 20th of *August*, could, unless fraudulently, find Admission into that Account, which was finally closed before the Receipt thereof.

The Agents for the Petitioners here rested their Evidence with Regard to that Part of their Charge relating to the auditing the Parish Accounts

D.

by

by the Select Vestry, concluded as to this Head with the following Observations,

1st, That the Parish Accounts are kept and audited in so loose and negligent a Manner, that the Parish was exposed to the Danger of being defrauded of great Sums of Money thro' the Means thereof.

2^{dly}, That the Vestries being not only impowered by the Watch-Act, made in 1736, to audit the Watch-Account, but required by the said Act to examine the said Accounts, had either not acted in Pursuance of the Law, if they had neglected to examine, which it was proved they had done in many Instances, by the Evidence of *William Godfrey*, or that if they had examined the said Accounts, they had been guilty of a great Breach of Trust in doing it with so little Care.

3^{dly}. That the said Vestry, in auditing the Accounts of the Overseers of the Poor, had acted contrary to Law, the Act of 43 *Elizabeth* expressly requiring this to be done by two Justices of the Peace.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to make good their next Allegation, that the Vestry assessed the Rates unequally and partially; and in this, they said, they confined themselves chiefly to the Rate for the Watch.

And as to this Point, to save the Time of the Committee, they referred to the Evidence which had been already given, under the Head of assessing and levying, in the Case of Dr. *Pierce*, Vicar of *St. Martin's*, and who had been reduced from 40*l* to 30*l* per Ann. who had affirmed, That his Predecessors, the Rectors of the said Parish, had been excused the Payment of all Rates, which the Petitioners apprehended to be warranted by no Law whatsoever.

They then produced the Watch-Rate, 1739. *Folio* 21. whereby it appeared, That *George Perkins*, a Vestryman, was reduced from 250 to 150*l*. per Ann.

They offered next, the Book of the second Rate to the Watch for *Spur-Alley-Ward*, 1739, *Folio* 58, by which it appeared, That *George Middleton*, a Vestryman, was rated in the Year 1739 at 138*l*. in the Year 1740 at 140*l*. and that he was reduced in the Year 1741 to 100*l*. and the Petitioners observed, that in the Year 1739, the Parish not being then rated at the Rack-Rent, and complaining of the Rates, the Rates was raised to the Rack-Rent in the Year 1740, when the said *George Middleton* was advanced as before observed; but that the Parish, in the Year 1741, pursuing their Disputes no further, and being then quieted, tho' the Rate continued at the Rack-Rent for the whole Parish, this *George Middleton* was then reduced.

The Agents for the Petitioners then offered to the Inspection of the Committee the Leidgers for the Watch-Rate for the Years 1739 and 1740, to prove the Partiality of the Vestry in assessing themselves.

And the Committee found, that the gross Assessment for the Watch-Rate in this Parish, in the Year 1740, amounted to

And that of the Year 1739, to

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
1390	13	1
1167	13	2

So that the Assessment was increased in the Year 1740 222 19 1

Which was an Increase upon the Inhabitants at large 1 Fifth nearly.

The

The Committee then proceeded to examine, Whether the Members of the Vestries were increased in the same Proportion, and in Order to save Time, they took the Rate of one Half Year, beginning 1740, and examined the Rates of eleven of the Vestrymen, as they happened to occur, which amounted to

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
665	0	0

And they likewise examined the Rates of the same eleven Vestrymen, for the half Year ending 1739, which amounted to

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
629	0	0

So that this Assessment was increased upon the Members of the Vestry, no more than 1-Seventeenth, nearly

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
36	0	0

By which it appeared to the Committee, that the Parish at large were increased in their Rates, in a much larger Proportion, than the Members of the Vestry at this Period of Time.

And the Petitioners concluded this Head of Evidence, with an Observation upon the Quantum of the Watch-Rate, which they apprehended to be much greater than the Occasions of the Service did demand. In Proof whereof, they produced the Collections from the Year 1736, to the Year 1740, inclusive, which amounted, at a Medium, to 945 *l.* per *Ann.* and which was sufficient to support the Expence. They likewise produced Proof, that the Debt of the Parish, on this Account, in the Year 1739, amounted to the Sum of 38 *l.* 17 *s.* 7 *d.*

From whence they inferred, That the Sum necessary to be raised upon the Watch Account, for the Year 1740, amounted to the Sum of 1043 *l.* 17 *s.* 7 *d.*

And they then produced the Assessment for the Year 1740, which amounted to 1390 *l.* 13 *s.* 1 *d.* So that the Parish was assessed in the Year 1740, a Sum of 346 *l.* 15 *s.* 6 *d.* more than at the End of the Year 1739, appeared sufficient to defray the Expences of that Year.

The Agents also produced the Watch-Leidger, by which it appeared, that, notwithstanding the extraordinary Assessment, for the Year 1740, in that Year was received and accounted for, including Arrears of former Years, no more than

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
987	18	3

That the Disbursements of that Year were

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
900	15	8

And consequently that the Surplus was

<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
87	2	7

Which, from a Collection, tho' so greatly short of the Assessment, left a Ballance to discharge the Debt of the Watch Account; so that, as they conceived, this extraordinary Assessment was absolutely unnecessary, and laid the whole Expence of that Year upon those Inhabitants who could be prevailed upon to pay it, whilst others thinking it illegal, refused such Payment, because a less Assessment by 1 Fifth, had formerly answered all Charges of this Account.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeds to prove the illegal Application of the Parish Money by the Vestries.

And they observed to the Committee, That this Matter seemed already in good Measure proved by several strong Instances under the last Head, where they had shewn so many Sums, carried false to the Parish Account, and so much more received upon the Rates than was accounted for.

And,

And, that it was likewise proved by Order of Vestry, dated the 27th of December 1740. (*Vide Appendix, Numb. IV.*) That all Charges at Law, in Defence of the Vestry, should be paid out of the Watch-Rate, which they apprehended to be an Application of the Parish Money illegal, as it was dangerous to the Liberties and Properties of the Petitioners.

But for further Proof,

They laid before the Committee, the Churchwardens Account of the Year 1726. In which Book, *Folio 70, 71*, there appeared two Entries of Interest Money, arising from 230 *l.* of the Parish Money, in *South-Sea Annuities*. The first of which Entries was of 2 *l.* 17 *s.* for one Quarter's Interest upon the Sum aforesaid, due at *Michaelmas* 1723.

The second Entry consisted of a Sum of 11 *l.* 10 *s.* said to be received in full of one Year's Interest upon the same Security, due at *Lady-Day* last.

Your Committee found no Date to this Entry, nor was the Year so much as specified, so that it was impossible to ascertain the Time exactly; but it was evident from the Book, that the *Lady-Day* mentioned in the Entry, was either in the Year 1725, or 1726; and in one Case it appeared, that there was an Interest of one Year and Half, and in the other Case, an Interest of two Years and a Half upon this Sum, which had not been accounted for to the Parish.

The Agents for the Petitioners then produced a Report, dated *February* the 4th 1725, from the Auditors of the Accounts of Mr. *John Walker*, Churchwarden for the Year 1724, 'That they had audited, examined, and found the same to be just, save only that by an Order of Vestry of the 24th of *February* 1724 last past, for empowering the Borrowing of 750 *l.* for paying for building the Workhouse lately erected in this Parish, and towards buying Necessaries for the same, Part thereof had been applied to the Church Account, and therefore they had not signed the said Accounts, but desired the Leave of this Board so to do.' Whereupon the Vestry made the following Order: 'That this Board apprehending that the Money so applied to the Church Account was thro' Inadvertency, it was therefore ordered, That the said Auditors be impowered to sign the said Account.' (*Vide Appendix, Numb. VI.*)

Another Entry, dated the 23d of *December* 1741, was then read, which is as follows. (*Vide Appendix, Numb. VIII.*)

'Mr. Churchwarden *Tucker* acquainted the Vestry, That he had received of Mr. *Thomas Siddall*, Treasurer of the Money arising on the Watch-Rates within this Parish, the Sum of 87 *l.* 16 *s.* 3 *d.* $\frac{1}{4}$, the Remainder of the Sum of 142 *l.* 12 *s.* 1 *d.* being the necessary Charges and Expences of passing the Act of Parliament made for the better regulating the Nightly Watch and Bedels, within this Parish, and heretofore advanced out of the Church Money, by Mr. *Peter Joumard*, Churchwarden of this Parish for the Year 1735; and that *William Bannister*, Churchwarden for the Year last past, has advanced divers Sums, of his own proper Money, for the Service of the Parish, during the Course of this Year. Agreed and Ordered, That the said Mr. *Tucker* do pay to the said Mr. *William Bannister*, the Sum of 60 *l.* on Account, and take a Receipt for the same.

'The Vestry being informed, that *Benjamin Martin*, a Collector of the Duties on Houses and Windows within this Parish, had received divers Sums of Money, in *Suffolk-Street* Ward, on the Rate for raising those Duties,

• Duties, and was dead ; and that, notwithstanding Distress had been
• made on the Goods and Effects, he died possessed of the Sum of
• 36*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* so by him received, yet remaining unpaid to the Ge-
• neral Receivers of that Duty, and that the same is required, by Act
• of Parliament for granting those Duties, to be made good by this
• Parish.

• Agreed and Ordered, That, Mr. Churchwarden *Tucker* be, and is
• hereby desired to pay the said Sum of 36*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* and to take a
• proper Receipt from the Receivers General for the same.

Whereupon the Petitioners observed, That, as they apprehended, the
Vestry had made an illegal Application of the Parish Money, by con-
firming the Accounts of *Thomas Walker*, Churchwarden in 1724, who
had diverted the Money arising from the Poor Account, to that of the
Church ; that they had acted in the same Manner in advancing out of
the Poor's Money in 1735, the Sum of 142*l.* 12*s.* 10*d.* for the Ex-
pences of procuring the Act for the Watch ; and that the Application
of 36*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* out of the Account of the Churchwarden, to answer
Insolvencies of a Collector of the Window Tax, and likewise contrary
to Law.

And they observed, That this Method, besides many other Inconve-
nencies, kept the Parish always ignorant whether the Sums raised upon
them for each Rate were necessary or not, since, under this Pretence of
applying the Money arising from each Rate, to Purposes distinct from
the Rate, the Inhabitants never could be certain whether they were justly
taxed or not ; that they were exposed thereby to many Expences at the
Caprice of the Vestry, in which they were never consulted, and which
they were unable to prevent, and subject to suffer by great Misappli-
cations, and partial Dissipations of the Money of the Parish.

And, to shew that this was not a bare Surmise, but an Evil which
they really suffered under,

They produced the Books of the Churchwardens for the Year 1726,
under the Article of Money disbursed on Account of the Poor, which
contained the following Articles :

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
<i>Folio</i> 50. <i>October</i> 20. For a Dinner and Breakfast to the Ringers, at the Consecration of the Church	18	0	10
The 26th ditto. For a Dinner and Expences at a Vi- sitation	10	3	0
<i>Folio</i> 51. <i>June</i> 22. Expences making a Scavenger's Rate	5	10	8
<i>July</i> 29. Expences on the Ringers, as by an Order of Vestry, whereby the Churchwardens were empowered to treat the Ringers in such Manner as they shall see proper	5	11	8
Ditto. For a Dinner for the Bedels	1	6	0
To the Duke of <i>Somerset's</i> Park-Keeper, for a Present of Venison	3	3	0
To Expences, by Order of Vestry, on a Dinner upon the Gentlemen who were Judges of the Organ	5	12	6
Ditto. Chusing Churchwardens	2	19	6
<i>Ibid.</i> <i>Folio</i> 77. Expences at making the Half Year's Rate for the Poor, 2d <i>Octob.</i> 1726	6	11	6
<i>Folio</i> 79. Ditto. For making another Half Year's Rate for the Poor, <i>April</i> 20	10	15	6
E			The

The Committee being desirous to see the Conduct of the Vestries in this Respect in some latter Account, called for that of the Year 1739, audited the 17th of *April* 1740, in which they observed the following Articles :

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
To the Duke of <i>Somerset's</i> Park-Keeper	2	12	6
For a Visitation Dinner	13	6	0

The Poor's Account, and Church Account of 1733, 1734 and 1735, as audited and allowed by the Vestry, was then laid before the Committee, and under the Head of Benefaction for binding out Apprentices, who were called *Sir Charles Cotterel's* Pensioners, your Committee observed a very extraordinary Entry, *viz.*

To	of the Parish of	bound to	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
	the Sum of		3	3	0

And in a Repetition of the same Article, with Blanks, another Sum of

The Agents for the Petitioners then produced Mr. <i>Turner</i> the Churchwarden's Account of Sacrament Wine, for the Year 1726, which amounted to	44	0	0
---	----	---	---

And the Committee being surprized at so large a Sum expended for that Purpose, called for the Vouchers of that Account ; by which it appeared, not only that several Quantities of Wines were charged in single Bottles and Pints, and in a Manner which seemed not to be for the Service of the Church ; but, that above One Third of the Wine charged, was Sack, Hock, White-wine and other Liquors, which, as they apprehended, were never used in the Celebration of that solemn Ceremony.

Your Committee, rather willing to conceive this done in a single Instance, than a constant Practice, called for an Account of Part of the Year 1727, ending *June* 24, which amounted to 10*l.* 7*s.* and upon Sight of the Vouchers, it appeared, that more than Half of that Sum, *viz.* 5*l.* 10*s.* 9*d.* was charged for Sack, White-Wine, Oranges, Sugar, Butter and Glass-Bottles.

The Committee likewise observed, That the Article of the Ringers, in the Churchwardens Account, which appeared to them Extravagant, no less being expended upon this Head alone, between the Years 1726 and 1738, than 304*l.* 13*s.* which amounts to more than 25*l.* *per Ann.*

The next Particular under this Head observed by your Committee, was an Article in the same Book, *Folio* 51, 1726, For Fees and Gifts, on receiving his Majesty's Bounty of 1500*l.* for furnishing an Organ, which is set down in one gross Sum of 118*l.* 15*s.* but no Vouchers or Particulars of this Account appeared to your Committee.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to shew the great Prices which the Vestry allow to the Tradesmen who serve this Parish, and are Members of the Vestry.

And they accordingly produced the Account of Glazier's Work, done by Mr. *Corner*, a Vestryman, in the Year 1730.

They then called in

Mr. *Charles Cairne*, one of the Kings Glaziers, to give his Opinion to the Committee, upon the Articles therein mentioned.

An

An Article was then read, for pinning several large, and several small Windows of the Church, in which the large were charged at 2 s. 6 d. each, and the small at 1 s.

With Regard to this Charge, Mr. *Cairne* informed the Committee, That 1 s. 6 d. was a very sufficient Price for the large Windows, and 9 d. for the small.

Another Article was then read, consisting of Square Glafs set in Lead for the same Use, which were charged at Six-pence each: To which Mr. *Cairne* being examined, said, That the King was charged Three-pence and no more for the same Species.

There was likewise an Article for pinning 20 Casements at 1 s. each, in the Church Account; and Mr. *Cairne* informed the Committee, that his Majesty was charged no more than Six-pence for the same Work.

The Petitioners then produced the Churchwardens Book for the Year 1738, allowed and signed by the Vestry and two Justices, *Samuel Gray* and Colonel *Burton*, in which Account the Committee observed an Article, dated the 26th of *April* in that Year, for 48 Yards of Velvet for two Palls, at 27 s. per Yard.

And Mr. *John Andrews*, Undertaker, being called in and questioned what Quantity of Velvet was necessary to make two Palls? He said, The best and largest Pall contained 20 Yards, and the Price of the Velvet was 1 l. 2 s. per Yard, and that the common Pall contained but 16 Yards, at 18 s.

The Sarsnet, in the same Account, for lining the two Palls, being charged at 4 s. 6 d. per Yard, Mr. *Andrews* was asked as to the usual Price of Sarsnet; and he informed the Committee, That he never gives more than 2 s. 6 d. for that Use, and that there is no Sarsnet at the Value of 4 s. 6 d. per Yard.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to shew the extravagant Encrease of Expence to the Parish in the Article of Candles for the Watch, and the Difference in this Account when an Inhabitant at large furnished the Candles, and when they were furnished by a Member of the Vestry; and they premised, that the Number of the Watch were not increased during the Time whereof they proposed to speak.

The Books of the Watch Account being then produced, it appeared, that, in the Year 1736, the Parish was served by one *Killingworth*, and amounted to no more than 250 Dozen, which was 62 l. 10 s. 10 d. $\frac{1}{2}$.

In the Beginning of the Year 1737 the said *Killingworth* furnished 49 Dozen, Value

12 0 5

But one *Vibert*, a Vestryman, being introduced into the Business soon after, furnished, the Remainder of that Year, a further Quantity of 322 Dozen 4 Pounds, Value

80 11 10

Which amount in the Whole to 371 Dozen 4 Pounds, Value

92 12 3

So that upon the Admission of a Vestryman into this Business, tho' but in a Part of the Year, the Quantity of Candles charged to the Parish, was 121 Doz. and 4 Pounds more than before, and the Expence encreased 32 l. 1 s. 4 d. $\frac{1}{2}$.

The

The same *Vibert* likewise furnished Candles in the Year 1738, 39, 40, which Years the Charge was as follows :

				<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>q.</i>
In 1738	348	Doz.	Value	89	17	2	0
1739	343	Doz.	Value	104	13	0	0
1740	338	Doz. 7 Pounds,	Value	123	3	4	$\frac{1}{2}$

Whereupon, the Petitioners observed, That the Nights were not longer in the Years 1738, 39, 40, than in the Year 1736, with which they concluded this Head of Evidence.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to the Article in the Petition relating to the secreting of Accounts from the Parishoners.

But as to this Head, they said, They should not give the Committee much Trouble, the Fact being notorious in the General, and claimed from the Nature of a Select Vestry.—That they should, therefore, confine themselves to the Watch-Books only, which, by Act of Parliament, they apprehended themselves to be intitled to see.

And then the Act for regulating the Nightly-Watch in this Parish being read, it appeared, That the Petitioners are intitled, by that Law, to see the Totals of all the Accounts relating to the Watch whenever they shall so require.

Mr. *Fabrie* being then called in and examined, said, That in the Year 1740, thinking himself aggrieved in the Watch-Rate, he applied to the Vestry to see the Rates, and determined to try the Matter at Law ; but being no Vestryman, the Vestry several Times refused him the Books, only they produced a Leidger, which contained the bare Totals of the Sum collected, which could give no Information ; and he was told, This was all he had a Right to see.—That he only asked to look at the Books, and was refused.—That he appealed to the Justices at the Quarter-Sessions ; that they construed the Law in a different Sense, and gave him an Order to see all the Books of that Account. But even after this, the Clerk, Churchwardens and Vestrymen shuffled him for some Time ; that, after some Interval, they sent to him to let him know, That he might have a Sight of the Books an Hour in a Day ; that they allowed him this Liberty the first Day to make Extracts ; but Mr. *Bannister*, the Churchwarden, attending the next Day, hindered him, and said, The Justices had no Power to make such an Order ; yet, at length, he was allowed a Copy of them, for which he paid Four Guineas.

Mr. *Henry Williams* being examined to the same Particular, said, That, before the Appeal to the Quarter-Sessions in *October* 1740, he demanded a Sight of the Watch-Books, and attended Mr. *Godfrey*, the Vestry-Clerk, two or three Times, but could not obtain the Perusal of any of them. That after the Order of the Quarter-Sessions beforementioned, with a View to delay, they interrupted them in their Search, and allowed them but two Hours in a Day.—That Mr. *Bannister*, the Churchwarden, interrupted them, and shut up the Books, notwithstanding the Order ; and tho' they attempted no other Use of them than to make Extracts. And, at last, when they procured the Copies, it was but a few Days before the Trial.

The Agents for the Petitioners then proceeded to prove, That the Vestry chose Officers of Profit and Trust, imposed burthenfome Offices on some, and excuse others for pecuniary Considerations.

And they produced the Minutes of the Vestry of the 9th of *December*, 1726. by which it appeared, that the Parish-Clerk was nominated by the Vicar,

Vicar, Dr. Pierce, and approved by the Vestry (*Vide Appendix, Numb. IX.*)

Another of the 7th of *March*, 1726, by which Mr. *Theophilus Cole* was appointed joint Organist with Mr. *Weldon*, (*Vide Appendix, Numb. X*)

And a Third of the 23d of *April*, 1740, when the Vestry chose *William Godfrey* to be Vestry-Clerk (*Vide Appendix, Numb. XI*)

And they were ready to have proceeded further to other Officers in the Parish, but the Committee thought this sufficient to this Point.

To prove that the Vestry elect Churchwardens, they produced the Vestry-Book, containing, An Order of Vestry, dated *April* the 7th, 1726, by which Mr. *Turner* and Mr. *House* were nominated Churchwardens (*Vide Appendix, Numb. XII*) and another Order of the 11th of the said Month, by which they were confirmed and chosen (*Vide Appendix, Numb. XIII*)

Mr. *Fabrie* being then examined, he said, That he attended last *Easter-Monday* in order to the Election of Churchwardens, but that he was shut out of the Vestry by the Vestrymen, as were also Two Hundred more of the Parishoners at large.

That the Parishoners conceiving it to be the Right of the Inhabitants at large, to choose Churchwardens, tried the Matter at Law in the *King's Bench*; that they lost their Cause, as they apprehend, by wrong Management, not being full enough in their Evidence to prove, That the Vestry of *St. Martin's* was not a Vestry by Prescription: So that the Custom was allowed to stand against the Inhabitants.

The Petitioners then produced a Minute of the Vestry of the 22d of *April*, 1736. (*Vide Appendix. Numb. XIV.*) which is in the following Words:

‘ Mr. *James Freeman* is nominated to be senior Churchwarden of this Parish for the present Year.

‘ This Board then proceeded to the Nomination of a junior Churchwarden to serve with the said Mr. *James Freeman* for the present Year, and Mr. *George Errington* was nominated to serve with the said Mr. *James Freeman*.

‘ Mr. *Abel Aldridge* acquainted this Board, That Mr. *George Errington* desired the Favour of this Vestry to be excused from serving the said Office, on his paying a Fine of 20*l.* for the Use of the Poor of the said Parish, and that the Vestry would accept the same.—It is therefore ordered, That the said Mr. *George Errington* be excused from serving the said Office, on his paying the said Fine of 20*l.* for the Use aforesaid.

‘ This Board then proceeded to the Nomination of a junior Churchwarden to serve in the Room of Mr. *George Errington*, and Mr. *James Hay* was nominated Churchwarden for the present Year.

‘ Mr. *Walter Turner* acquainted this Board, That Mr. *James Hay* desired the Favour of being excused from serving the said Office of Churchwarden, upon his paying a Fine of 20*l.* for the Use of the Poor of this Parish, and that this Board would be pleased to accept the same. It is therefore ordered, That Mr. *James Hay* be excused from serving the said Office, on his paying the said Fine of 20*l.* to the Use aforesaid.

‘ This Board then proceeded to the Nomination of a Churchwarden in the Room of the said *James Hay*, and Mr. *Daniel Bell* was nominated Churchwarden for this present Year.

‘ Mr. *William Leeson* acquainted this Board, That Mr. *Daniel Bell* desired the Favour of being excused from serving the said Office of Churchwarden, upon his paying a Fine of 20*l.* for the Use of the Poor of

‘ this Parish, and that this Board would be pleased to accept the same.
 ‘ It is therefore ordered, That the said Mr. *Daniel Bell* be excused from
 ‘ serving the said Office, on his paying the said Fine of 20*l.* for the Use
 ‘ aforeaid.

‘ This Board then proceeded to the Nomination of a Churchwarden to
 ‘ serve in the Room of the said Mr. *Daniel Bell*, and Mr. *Benjamin Cox*
 ‘ was nominated Churchwarden for this present Year.

‘ Mr. Churchwarden *Freeman* acquainted this Board, That Mr. *Benja-
 ‘ min Cox* desired the Favour of being excused from serving the Office
 ‘ of Churchwarden, on his paying a Fine of 20*l.* for the Use of the Poor
 ‘ of this Parish, and that this Board would be pleased to accept the same.
 ‘ It is therefore ordered, That Mr. *Benjamin Cox* be excused from his
 ‘ serving the said Office, on his paying the said Fine for the Use afore-
 ‘ said.

‘ This Board again proceeded to the Nomination of a Churchwarden
 ‘ in the Room of the said Mr. *Benjamin Cox*, and Mr. *Robert Watson* was
 ‘ nominated and chosen Churchwarden for this present Year, and accepted
 ‘ the same accordingly.’

Whereupon the Agents observed, That, however they might be re-
 strained from complaining, that the Vestry took upon them to elect
 Churchwardens, contrary to the Law of the Land, and the Usage in most
 other Parts of the Nation, by the late Determination in the Court of
King’s Bench in Favour of the Vestry ; yet, that no Law did warrant the
 Exercise of a Power in that Body to excuse Persons regularly nominated
 to that Office, or to receive Money in Lieu of that Service ; and that
 they had, in this *one* Year, and in Regard to this Office, only excused
 four Persons, and received no less than 80*l.* for that Favour, as they
 term it. That as to the just Application of the Money so raised, they
 allowed it to have been applied for the Use for which it was said to be re-
 ceived ; but that there was a very heavy Rate levied constantly for the
 Poor of the Parish, notwithstanding the Receipt of these Sums : And
 that they conceived, That this Rate was the only legal Provision for the
 Poor. They observed likewise, That this Power opened a Field to great
 Partiality and Injustice, and enabled the Vestry, for ever, to excuse their
 Friends, and to lay the whole Burthen of Parish Duties upon such Persons
 as was obnoxious to them.

They then proceeded to prove, That the Vestry likewise elected their
 Overseers of the Poor.

And an Order of Vestry of the same Date with the last was read (*Vide
 Appendix, Numb. XIV.*) by which several Persons were summoned to take
 upon them the Office of the Overseers of the Poor.

As likewise another Order to the same Effect, dated the 3d of *April*,
 1729 (*Vide Appendix, Numb. XV.*) which was followed by one of the
 7th of the same Month, in these Words, ‘ That if any Person be de-
 ‘ sirous to pay a Fine to be excused that Office, that the Churchwardens
 ‘ do likewise in this Case, as in the former, take the Money for the Use
 ‘ of the Poor (*Vide Appendix, Numb. XVI.*)’

Mr. *Miller* being examined to this Matter of the Election of Over-
 seers of the Poor, informed the Committee, That the Justices know no-
 thing of the Election till the Warrants are (out of Form) brought to
 them to sign. That in the last Year, 1741, upon the Disputes in the
 Parish, he broke thro’ this Practice, and conformed to the Act of Par-
 liament of 43 *Eliz.* but that, before that Time, the Vestry chose such
 Overseers as would dance after the Pipe of the Vestrymen.

Mr.

Mr. *Fabrie* confirmed this Account of Mr. *Miller*, and said, That the Vestry continued to act in this illegal Manner till *March 1741*, when the Parish having commenced a Suit at Law against the Vestry, out of the Apprehension that they should be questioned for this, as well as other Branches of their Conduct, they came with a regular Method as to the Election of Overseers.

The Agents for the Petitioners then came to that Article of the Petition, in which it was asserted, That the Vestries, in general, managed all Affairs of the Parish; and as to this Head they observed, That it was a notorious Truth, which had been fully-proved by the Evidence already produced to the Committee. That it was not advanced so much by Way of Charge against the Vestries (since it was the natural Constitution of all Select Vestries) as to observe a Fact, which, considering the Manner of their Management, was a great Misfortune to the Petitioners.

They then proceeded to shew the Constitution of the Vestry, and the Right upon which it was founded, which they observe would serve not only for the Parish of *St. Martin*, but also to the Parishes of *St. Anne*, *St. James*, and *St. George Hanover-Square*, they being formerly Members of, and, not many Years since, erected into distinct Parishes out of *St. Martin's* by different Acts of Parliament, which all prescribe, that they should be governed by the Example of their Mother Parish.

Mr. *Fabrie* being examined to this Particular, informed the Committee, That, upon the last Disputes at Law, in which he was concerned, he has occasion to examine the Constitution of the Vestries, and found several ancient Entries which differed in Practices, but in the General seemed to imply, that the Parish had been governed by a select Number of the Inhabitants from the Time of Queen *Elizabeth*. That in the Time of the great Rebellion, the Constitution seemed to have been altered; but that, soon after the Restoration, viz. 1662, Twenty-three of the Inhabitants applied to the Bishop of *London* for a Faculty to constitute a Select Vestry. Whereupon an Instrument was granted, appointing Fifty-two Inhabitants to be a Select Vestry, with the Minister and Churchwardens, and ten to be a Quorum: That this Quorum being found too large, the major Part of the Vestry applied by Certificate a second Time to the Bishop of *London* in 1673, who granted another Instrument, reducing the Quorum to the Number of Seven.

And these two Instruments being produced to the Committee,

William Godfrey, the Vestry-Clerk, was called in: And being questioned, Whether the Vestry acted under these Faculties? He said, That he has known the Vestry nine Years, and that they conformed to the Bishop's Faculties before mentioned.

Being then asked, Whether the Vestry consisted of Fifty-two? He said, That Fifty-two was their Number, when compleat; but that they may, and do, neglect to fill up Vacancies as long as they please, and that they fill up themselves, and choose their Successors.

Whereupon the Agents for the Petitioners took Notice, That they thought themselves in Decency obliged to avoid any Reflexions which might naturally result from the Institution of the Select Vestry, as it had been explained to the Committee; for though they should have thought themselves at Liberty to have offered Reasons to prove, that the Bishop of *London* had no Power to erect a Constitution of such a Kind, as being contrary to the Common Law of the Land, which avows no
Parish

Parish Government of such a Nature : And though it was confessed, that the Vestry acted under that Constitution of the Bishop, and conform'd themselves thereto ; yet, as Judgment had been lately given in the *King's-Bench*, That this Select Vestry acted by a prescriptive Title, they should be careful to say nothing that should seem to clash with the Determination of that Court: But they begged Leave to observe, that they were thereby deprived of all Hope of Relief from the Courts of Justice, against this exclusive and excessive Authority, void of all Comp-rol, and privately conducted and vested in a Few, who perpetuated their Government, by an arbitrary Election of the Members of their own Body, among themselves ; and that they were therefore reduced to the Necessity of this Application to the Legislature, from whose Wisdom and Justice alone they hoped Relief.

And here they closed what they thought fit to offer, with Regard to the Parish of *St. Martin's*.



APPENDIX.

NUMB. I.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room*, September 21, 1725.

PRESENT,

The Rev. <i>Zach. Pearce</i> , Vicar.	Mr. <i>William Grimes</i> ,
<i>Roger Millert</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>Walter Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>William Bentley</i> ,
Mr. <i>Phillip Davis</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>Abel Aldridge</i> } Churchwardens

Ordered,

That the Committee appointed to consider of a House in this Parish, for the Lodging and Maintaining the Poor of the said Parish, be summoned to meet To-morrow at Three of the Clock in the Afternoon, in the Vestry-Room, to examine the Books for the Poor's-Rate, in Order to rectify the Rents, and make the same more equitable for the next Half Year's Rent.

Ordered,

That the Overseers be summoned to be then attending with the Poor's Books, in order to be assisting in rectifying the Rents for the Poor's-Rate, and that the Bedels be summoned to attend at Three o'Clock in the Afternoon in the Vestry Room.

This Board taking into their Consideration, a Rate to be made for the Relief of the Poor, for the second Half Year of this present Year, agreed, That one Shilling in the Pound must be raised for the said Half Year.

NUMB. II.

St. Martin in the Fields, Easter-
Monday, April 7, 1740.

} At a Vestry held in the Vestry-Room
of the said Parish, this 7th of April
1740.

PRESENT

The Rev. Mr. Dean <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>Benjamin Cox</i> ,
Mr. <i>George Errington</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Cross</i> ,
Mr. <i>Abel Aldridge</i> ,	Mr. <i>J. Carpenter</i> ,
Mr. <i>Daniel Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>Charles Haman</i> ,
Mr. <i>Benjamin Goodison</i> ,	Mr. <i>Robert Watson</i> ,
Mr. <i>H. Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>Peter Joumard</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,	Mr. <i>Thomas Siddall</i> ,
Mr. <i>Walter Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>Christopher Harris</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Hart</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Bannister</i> } Churchwardens.

G

This

This Board taking into Consideration, a Rate to be made for the Relief of the Poor of this Parish, for this present Half Year, is of Opinion, That a Rate of Eight-pence in the Pound, will be proper to be made on all and every the Inhabitants of this Parish, and that the several Houses be rated at the full Rent and Value thereof; and that the Gentlemen of the Vestry be desired to attend and be assisting in the several Wards wherein they dwell, in making the said Rate.

NUMB. III.

St. Martin in the Fields, } At a Vestry held for the said Parish, in the
April 23. 1740. } Vestry-Room thereof, this 23d of April 1740.

PRESENT

The Rev. Mr. Dean <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	<i>William Jones</i> , Esq;
Mr. <i>John Sawyer</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,
Mr. <i>Christopher Harris</i> ,	Mr. <i>William House</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Jones</i> ,	Mr. <i>Lancelot Vibert</i> ,
Mr. <i>William Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>Thomas Siddall</i> ,
Mr. <i>Benjamin Cox</i> ,	Mr. <i>Daniel Bell</i> ,
Mr. <i>William Haines</i> ,	Mr. <i>William Atkinson</i> ,
Mr. <i>William Nind</i> ,	Mr. <i>Peter Joumard</i> ,
Mr. <i>Charles Haman</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Mallory</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,	Mr. <i>Collet Mawhood</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Kirk</i> ,	Mr. <i>James Hay</i> ,
Mr. <i>Abel Aldridge</i> ,	Mr. <i>Galsfridus Man</i> ,
<i>John Huggins</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Andrew Drummond</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Carpenter</i> ,	
Mr. <i>Walter Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Hart</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Cross</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Bannister</i> ,
<i>George Errington</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>M. Tucker</i> , Churchward. Elect.

} Churchwardens.

The Orders of the last Vestry were read, Article by Article, and confirmed, except that Part of an Order concerning the making of a Rate of Eight-pence in the Pound, for the Relief of the Poor of this Parish, for the present Half Year, and the assessing of the several Houses at the full Rent or Value thereof; which, so far as relates thereto, is hereby repealed; and it is agreed by this Vestry, That a Rate of Ten-pence in the Pound will be proper to be made for the Purpose aforesaid, and that the several Houses within this Parish, be rated only at 4-Fifths of the full Rent or Value thereof.

NUMB. IV.

The Parish of St. Martin in the Fields. } At a Vestry held for the said Parish in the Vestry-Room thereof, on Saturday the 27th of December 1740, about the Nightly Watch and Bedels.

PRESENT

The Rev. Mr. Dean Pearce, Vicar.	Mr. John Carpenter,
Mr. Daniel Bell,	Mr. Lancelot Vibert,
Mr. William Leeson,	Philip Craig, Esq;
Mr. Thomas Siddall,	Mr. Collet Mawhood,
Mr. Robert Watson,	The Hon. E. Southwell, Esq;
Mr. Abel Aldridge,	Mr. Joumard,
John Huggins, Esq;	Mr. W. Bannister, } Churchwardens.
Mr. John Jones,	Mr. M. Tucker, }

NUMB. V.

At a Vestry held in St. Martin's Vestry-Room, in St. Martin's-Lane, on Easter Monday, March 29, 1725.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Zach. Pearce, Vicar,	Mr. William Bentley,
Henry Southwell, Esq;	Mr. Walter Turner,
Mr. John Bell,	Mr. John Robinson,
Mr. John Hall,	Mr. William Leeson,
Mr. William Grimes,	Mr. Thomas Millington,
Mr. Thomas Head,	Mr. John Creswell,
Sir John Colebatch, Knt.	Mr. Giles Harris,
Mr. Henry Warcopp,	Mr. Henry Haydock,
Roger Millart, Esq;	
Mr. Philip Davis,	Mr. J. Walker, } Churchwardens.
Mr. James Rainge,	Mr. J. Sawcer, }

Ordered,

That the Rev. Dr. Zach. Pearce,	Mr. John Bell,
Henry Southwell, Esq;	Mr. William Grimes,
Mr. John Hall,	Sir John Colebatch, Knt.
Mr. Thomas Head,	Roger Millart, Esq;
Mr. Henry Warcopp,	Mr. James Rainge,
Mr. Philip Davis,	Mr. Walter Turner,
Mr. William Bentley,	Mr. William Leeson,
Mr. John Robinson,	Mr. John Creswell,
Mr. Thomas Millington,	Mr. Henry Haydock,
Mr. Giles Harris,	

and the two Churchwardens and other Gentlemen of the Vestry that please, be appointed Auditors of the Churchwardens and Overseers Accounts of last Year.

NUMB.

NUMB. VI.

At a Meeting of the Vestry, in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room*, *February*
the 4th 1725.

PRESENT

The Rev. <i>Zach. Pearce</i> , Vicar,	<i>Mr. John Robinson</i> ,
<i>Sir C. Desbouverie</i> , Knt.	<i>Mr. Thomas Boucher</i> ,
<i>Robert Mann</i> , Esq;	<i>Mr. Giles Harris</i> ,
<i>Mr. William Leeson</i> ,	<i>Mr. Henry Warcopp</i> ,
<i>Mr. John Hall</i> ,	<i>Mr. Walter Turner</i> ,
<i>Mr. Edward Bulpen</i> ,	<i>Mr. John Creswell</i> ,
<i>Mr. John Bell</i> ,	<i>Mr. Robert Burton</i> ,
<i>Mr. Thomas Head</i> ,	<i>Mr. Henry Haydock</i> ,
<i>Mr. George Gilbert</i> ,	<i>Mr. Thomas Millington</i> ,
<i>Mr. Pauncefote Green</i> ,	
<i>Mr. Collet Mawhood</i> ,	<i>Mr. J. Sawcer</i> } Churchwardens.
<i>Mr. James Buffar</i> ,	<i>Mr. A. Aldridge</i> }

The Auditors appointed to audit the Accounts.

Mr. John Walker, Churchwarden for the Year 1724 last past, reported to this Board, That they had audited the same, and examined the several Vouchers relating thereto, and found the same to be just, save only that by an Order of Vestry the 24th of *February* in the Year 1724 last past, for the Impowering the Borrowing of 750*l.* for paying for building the Workhouse lately erected in this Parish, and towards buying Necessaries for the same, Part thereof had been applied to the Church Account, and that therefore they had not signed the said Accounts, but desired the Leave of this Board so to do.

This Board apprehending, that the Money so applied to the Church Account was thro' Inadvertency, it is therefore Ordered, that the said Auditors be empowered to sign the said Accounts.

NUMB. VII.

St. Martin } At a Vestry held in the Vestry-Room, in and for the said
in the Fields. } Parish, on *Monday* the 27th Day of *July*, in the Year of
our Lord 1741.

PRESENT

The Rev. <i>Mr. T. Taylor</i> , Curate,	<i>Mr. Henry Warcopp</i> ,
<i>Mr. Walter Turner</i> ,	<i>Mr. Lancelot Vibert</i> ,
<i>Mr. Benjamin Cox</i> ,	<i>Mr. William Leeson</i> ,
<i>Mr. Peter Joumard</i> ,	<i>Mr. John Carpenter</i> ,
<i>Mr. Thomas Siddall</i> ,	
<i>Mr. John Kirk</i> ,	<i>Mr. M. Tucker</i> } Churchwardens.
<i>John Huggins</i> , Esq;	<i>Mr. W. Wood</i> }

The Account of *Thomas Middleton*, Collector of the two Half Year's Rates for the Nightly Watch, and Bedels of this Parish, for the Year ending on the 3d Day of *May* last past, being made and delivered to this Vestry,

Vestry, and a Ballance appearing to be due thereon from the said Accountant of Five Pounds Twelve Shillings and Nine-pence; It is Ordered by this Vestry, That the said *Thomas Middleton* do pay over the said Ballance into the Hands of *Mr. Thomas Siddall*, and that the said Account, as well as the Account of all Monies received and paid in Pursuance of the Act of Parliament, be fairly entered in the Book, kept for that Purpose, on or before the 20th Day of *August* next.

NUMB. VIII.

St. Martin in the Fields, } At a Vestry held this Day in the Vestry-
December 23, 1741. } Room, in and for the said Parish.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dean <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>Benjamin Cox</i> ,
Mr. <i>Walter Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>Abel Aldridge</i> ,
Mr. <i>George Errington</i> ,	Mr. <i>Robert Watson</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Siddall</i> ,	Mr. <i>Daniel Bell</i> ,
Mr. <i>William Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>George Cure</i> ,
Mr. <i>Benjamin Goodison</i> ,	Mr. <i>M. Tucker</i> ,
<i>John Huggins</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>W. Wood</i> ,
	} Churchwardens.

NUMB. IX.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room*, Dec. 9, 1726.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	<i>Samuel Grey</i> , Esq;
<i>Henry Southouse</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>John Creswell</i> ,
Mr. <i>James Rainge</i> ,	Mr. <i>George Gilbert</i> ,
Mr. <i>James Bustar</i> ,	Mr. <i>Thomas Millington</i> ,
<i>Francis Burton</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Edward Bulpen</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Walker</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>Collet Mawhood</i> ,	Mr. <i>Giles Harris</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Drummond</i> ,	Mr. <i>William Leeson</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Boucher</i> ,	<i>Robert Mann</i> , Esq;
<i>John Huggins</i> , Esq;	Sir <i>J. Colebatch</i> , Knt.
Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,	Mr. <i>Edmund Aubery</i> ,
Mr. <i>Philip Davis</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Hall</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,
Mr. <i>David Kilmaine</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Perkins</i> ,
Mr. <i>Pauncefote Green</i> ,	Mr. <i>Robert Burton</i> .
Mr. <i>John Robinson</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Turner</i> ,
Mr. <i>Richard Downes</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. House</i> ,
	} Churchwardens.

The Rev. Dr. *Pearce*, having nominated and presented *John Horsley*, Batchelor of Arts, to be Parish-Clerk in the Room of *Joseph Ellison*,
H Master

Master of Arts, deceased ; this Board does unanimously approve thereof ; and thereupon the said Dr. *Zachariah Pearce*, has pronounced the said *John Horsley* to be Parish Clerk, and to enjoy all Fees, Perquisites and Profits belonging to that Place.

NUMB. X.

At a Vestry held in St. *Martin's* Vestry-Room, *March 7, 1726.*

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Zach. Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>James Rainge</i> ,
Sir <i>Christ. Desbouverie</i> , Knt.	Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,
Sir <i>John Colebatch</i> , Knt.	Mr. <i>George Gilbert</i> ,
<i>John Huggins</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>William Leeson</i> ,
<i>Henry Southouse</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>John Walker</i> ,
<i>Richard Miller</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Edward Bulpen</i> ,
Mr. <i>Collet Mawhood</i> ,	Mr. <i>Daniel Kilmaine</i> ,
Mr. <i>Pauncesote Green</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Creswell</i> ,
Mr. <i>James Buffar</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Boucher</i> ,	
Mr. <i>John Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Turner</i> ,
Mr. <i>Giles Harris</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. House</i> ,

} Churchwardens.

This Board proceeded to the Election or Choice of an Organist, to be Joint-Organist with Mr. *John Weldon*, now Organist to this Parish, and Mr. *Theophilus Cole* was chosen Joint-Organist with the said Mr. *Weldon*.

Ordered and agreed, That the said Mr. *John Weldon* and Mr. *Theophilus Cole* do alternately play this Parish Organ.

Ordered and agreed, That the said Mr. *John Weldon* have twenty Guineas yearly for his Salary for playing this Parish Organ ; and also, that from the aforesaid Time, Mr. *Theophilus Cole* have twenty Pounds yearly for his Salary for playing the said Organ.

NUMB. XI.

St. Martin in the Fields, } At a Vestry held for the said Parish, in the
April 23, 1740. } Vestry-Room thereof, this 23d Day of *April*
 1740.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Mr. <i>Dean Pearce</i> , Vicar.	Mr. <i>W. Haines</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Nind</i> .
Mr. <i>Christopher Harris</i>	Mr. <i>Charles Haman</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Jones</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Kirk</i> ,
Mr. <i>Benjamin Cox</i> ,	Mr. <i>A. Aldridge</i> ,

Mr.

Mr. Peter Joumard,
 Mr. John Mallory,
 Mr. C. Mawhood,
 John Huggins, Esq;
 Mr. John Carpenter,
 Mr. W. Turner,
 Mr. John Cross,
 George Errington, Esq;
 W. Jones, Esq;
 Mr. Henry Warcopp,
 Mr. W. House,

Mr. Lancelot Vibert,
 Mr. Thomas Siddall,
 Mr. D. Bell,
 Mr. W. Atkinson,
 Mr. James Hay,
 Mr. Galfridus Mann,
 Mr. Andrew Drummond,

Mr. W. Hart, } Churchwardens
 Mr. W. Bannister, }
 Mr. M. Tucker, Churchward. Elect.

Upon Reading the humble Petition of *John Godfrey*, Praying, This Honourable Vestry would be pleased to elect and choose him to be Clerk of the Vestry of this Parish, in the Room and Place of *William Head*, who resigned; and the Question being thereupon put, the said *John Godfrey* was unanimously elected and chosen Clerk of the Vestry of this Parish, in the Room and Place of the said *William Head*, and is hereby ordered to give his Attendance thereon accordingly; and that he have and enjoy the like Salary, Fees and Perquisites as the said *William Head* had and enjoyed.

NUMB. XII.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's* Vestry-Room, on *Maundy Thursday*, April 7, 1726.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Mr. Dean Pearce, Vicar.	Mr. W. Grimes,
Mr. Henry Southouse,	Mr. Thomas Boucher,
Mr. W. Leeson,	Mr. G. Harris,
Mr. John Bell,	Mr. James Buffar,
Mr. Thomas Head,	Mr. John Creswell,
Mr. Walter Turner,	Mr. George Gilbert,
Roger Millart, Esq;	Mr. David Kilmaine,
Mr. P. Davis,	Mr. Pauncesote Green,
Mr. Roger Askew,	
Mr. Henry Haydock,	Mr. J. Sawcer, } Churchwardens.
Mr. John Hall,	Mr. A. Aldridge, }

This Board unanimously requested Mr. *Walter Turner*, one of the Gentlemen of this Board, to accept of the Office of Churchwarden, in the Room and Place of Mr. *Abel Aldridge*; and he was pleased to accept the same accordingly.

Then this Board proceeded to the Nomination of a Churchwarden, to serve with the said Mr. *Walter Turner*, for this present Year; and Mr. *William House* was nominated Churchwarden, to serve with the said Mr. *Walter Turner*.

NUMB.

NUMB. XIII.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room*, on *Easter-Monday*,
April the 11th, 1726.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	<i>Roger Millart</i> , Esq;
<i>Henry Southouse</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>James Buffar</i> ,
Mr. <i>G. Harris</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Turner</i> ,
Mr. <i>C. Mawhood</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Head</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Robinson</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>Pauncesote Green</i> ,
Mr. <i>Daniel Kilmaine</i> ,	Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Grimes</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Hall</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>C. Haman</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Boucher</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>P. Davis</i> ,	Mr. <i>Thomas Millington</i> ,
Mr. <i>George Gilbert</i> ,	Mr. <i>J. Sawcer</i> ,
Mr. <i>Edward Bulpen</i> ,	Mr. <i>A. Aldridge</i> ,
	} Churchwardens.

Mr. Walter Turner and *Mr. William House*, are hereby chosen and confirmed Churchwardens.

NUMB. XIV.

St. Martin } At a Vestry held for the said Parish, in the Vestry-Room,
in the Fields. } on *Maundy-Thursdai*, *April 22*, 1736.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Zach. Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>W. Leeson</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>P. Davis</i> ,
Mr. <i>A. Aldridge</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Shackley</i> ,
Mr. <i>C. Haman</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Carpenter</i> ,
Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. House</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Haines</i> .
Mr. <i>James Tickner</i> ,	Mr. <i>Christopher Harris</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Young</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Kirk</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,	
Mr. <i>James Buffar</i> ,	Mr. <i>P. Joumard</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,	Mr. <i>J. Freeman</i> ,
	} Churchward.

The Names of divers Persons were this Day read at this Board, as Persons fitly qualified for serving the Office of Overseers of the Poor of this Parish for this present Year: It is therefore Ordered, That the said Persons be duly summoned to appear at this Board on *Monday* next, at Nine of the Clock in the Afternoon, to take upon them the said Office.

NUMB.

NUMB. XV.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room, Maundy-Thursday,*
April the 3d, 1729.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
<i>W. Gore</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Jon Bell</i> ,
<i>Francis Burton</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,
<i>Robert Mann</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>John Creswell</i> ,
<i>Sam. Grey</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>A. Aldridge</i> ,
Mr. <i>C. Mawhood</i> ,	Mr. <i>C. Haman</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>George Gilbert</i> ,
Mr. <i>P. Davis</i> ,	Mr. <i>W. Leeson</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Robinson</i> ,	Mr. <i>A. Small</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Walker</i> ,	Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,
Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,	Mr. <i>James Rainge</i> ,
Mr. <i>Pauncefote Green</i> ,	Mr. <i>James Buffar</i> ,
Mr. <i>Thomas Boucher</i> ,	Mr. <i>Edward Bulpen</i> ,
Mr. <i>Andrew Drummond</i> ,	Mr. <i>C. Corner</i> ,
Mr. <i>Robert Burton</i> ,	Mr. <i>E. Impey</i> ,

} Churchwardens.

The Names of divers Persons were this Day read to this Board, as fit and able Persons qualified for serving the Office of Overseers of the Poor of this Parish, for this present Year.

It is therefore Ordered, That the said Persons be duly summoned to appear at this Board, on *Monday* next, at Eight of the Clock in the Forenoon, to take upon them the said Office.

NUMB. XVI.

At a Vestry held in *St. Martin's Vestry-Room, on Easter-Monday,*
April 7, 1729.

PRESENT,

The Rev. Dr. <i>Pearce</i> , Vicar,	Mr. <i>Henry Haydock</i> ,
Mr. <i>Roger Askew</i> ,	Mr. <i>Thomas Boucher</i> ,
Mr. <i>Pauncefote Green</i> ,	Mr. <i>Edward Bulpen</i> ,
Mr. <i>C. Mawhood</i> ,	Mr. <i>Abel Aldridge</i> ,
Mr. <i>W. Leeson</i> ,	Mr. <i>G. Gilbert</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Walker</i> ,	Mr. <i>John Creswell</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Sawcer</i> ,	Mr. <i>Henry Warcopp</i> ,
Mr. <i>James Buffar</i> ,	Mr. <i>P. Davis</i> ,
Mr. <i>C. Haman</i> ,	Mr. <i>Giles Harris</i> ,
Mr. <i>John Bell</i> ,	Mr. <i>James Rainge</i> ,
<i>Sam. Grey</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>Thomas Millington</i> ,
<i>W. Gore</i> , Esq;	Mr. <i>C. Corner</i> ,
Mr. <i>Walter Turner</i> ,	Mr. <i>E. Impey</i> ,

} Churchwardens.

F I N I S.

At a Party held in St. Martin's Valley Room, January 30, 1939.

PRESENT

Mr. Henry Haydock,
Mr. John Bell,
Mr. John Sawyer,
Mr. John C. Smith,
Mr. A. Aldrich,
Mr. C. Hamlin,
Mr. George Elliot,
Mr. W. L. Jackson,
Mr. A. Small.



The Rev. Dr. Paine, Vice,
 W. Carr, Esq;
 Francis Butler, Esq;
 Robert Mann, Esq;
 Sam. Gray, Esq;
 Mr. C. Matthews
 Mr. W. Turner,
 Mr. P. Davis,
 Mr. John Robinson,
 Mr. John Walker,
 Mr. Henry W. Hargrove,
 Mr. P. H. H. Green,
 Mr. Thomas Hargrove,
 Mr. Andrew Hargrove,
 Mr. Robert Hargrove.

The Names of these Persons were this Day read to the Board, as
it and able Persons qualified for having the Office of Overseers of the
Poor of this Parish for the present Year.

NUMB. XVI.

At a Valley held in St. Lawrence Valley, on 17th May 1790.

THESE

[Faint, illegible text from bleed-through]

The Rev. Dr. P. W. ...
Mr. R. ...
Mr. P. ...
Mr. C. ...
Mr. W. ...
Mr. J. ...
Mr. J. ...
Mr. J. ...
Mr. J. ...
Mr. J. ...
Mr. J. ...

[illegible]